DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 032 274 SP 003 057

By-Allen, Dwight W.
Needed: A New Professionalism in Education.
American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.
Pub Date May 68
Note-8p.; Presented at a meeting to lay the groundwork for administering EPDA.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.50
Descriptors-Differentiated Staffs, *Educational Change, Educational Research, Individualized Instruction, Teacher Education, *Teaching

Education as a professional endeavor must undergo radical changes which will institutionalize change so that it becomes an integral part of the educational structure, thereby meeting the needs of society and individual students as they arise. These priorities seem essential: dynamic definitions of and distinctions among educational roles and tasks, based on a continuously ongoing analysis of educational functions; teacher training built around such definitions; aid via resources and talent to initiate and support programs aimed at improving teacher training institutions; assignment and compensation of teachers on the basis of skill, talent, responsibility, and other relevant professional criteria; flexibility in the educational framework, school organization, and research enterprise; relevant performance criteria for evaluating teaching effectiveness and student achievement; inservice teacher training which will update and upgrade professional skills; cross-coordination of faculty effort to produce a meaningful interdisciplinary approach to learning; penetrating investigation of the relevance to society and the individual of what is and should be included in curriculums; cooperative service and research centers, on a regional or national basis, which will coordinate and disseminate efforts at all levels to upgrade professional competence; concentrated attention on the problems of educating underprivileged individuals and institutions. (JS)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED032274

PROCESS WITH MICROFICHE AND PUBLISHER'S PRICES. MICROFICHE REPRODUCTION ONLY.

Needed: A New Professionalism in Education

By Dwight W. Allen, Dean
School of Education
University of Massachusetts

There can no longer be any doubt that education as a professional endeavor must undergo radical changes in the decades ahead. The present attempts to apend minor improvements to the maze of existing practices are simply not sufficiently bold and imaginative to keep pace with the rapidly changing needs that face American education. If meaningful changes are to be made in the profession, we must go beyond the mere development of new variations on old themes. In fact, professionalism in education is likely to die out unless we capitalize on the process of change. We must institutionalize change so that it becomes an integral part of the educational structure, thereby meeting the functional needs of society and individual students as they arise.

The first step in the endeavor to institutionalize change is the thorough analysis of educational roles, tasks, structure, and objectives. If we are even to begin developing professional competence that is adequate and relevant, we must start with careful consideration of the criteria by which meaningful decisions can be made regarding all aspects of the educational enterprise. All too often we have instituted change without such previous analysis; thus, our innovations have been viewed solely through the rather muddied perspective of traditional systems. If we wish to make education truly responsive to the changing needs of both society and its individuals, we can do so only by paying attention to goals and their criteria at the outset. To proceed otherwise, as we have been proceeding, is to virtually assure that the traditional will out-survive its usefulness, if only due to inertia. When criteria for success are absent, it is all too easy to hang on to the traditional,

DEDICATED TO THE IMPROVEMENT OF TEACHER EDUCATION
aacte

This paper is presented to the teacher education community to encourage a continuing dialog concerning issues facing American education. The society is calling for dramatic and dynamic educational services to all ages. The preparation of effective teachers is necessary if the schools are to be able to meet the imperatives of the times.

Dwight Allen presented this paper to a distinguished group convened some time ago to lay the groundwork for administering the Education Professions Development Act. Much has happened since his presentation. The issues still are relevant, both in anticipation of the development of EPDA and for its general significance to teacher education.

Presented as a service by
The American Association of
Colleges for Teacher Education

Washington, D.C. 20036

May 1968

SP003057

which succeeds under the only remaining criterion--survival.

The recent efforts to distinguish professional from nonprofessional tasks in the school by introducing clerical and technical assistants exemplify the timorous and backward nature of our current perspectives on professionalism. Our approach is timorous, if not absurd, when we propose the professional *versus* nonprofessional distinction as valid and necessary (which it is) and at the same time make the availability of nonprofessional staff contingent upon the availability of funds. If, in fact, the clerical tasks which teachers perform take up a large portion of their time, then it becomes a mockery of professionalism to view clerical support as *optional* in any way.

Our current stance is also both timorous and backward when we distinguish professional from nonprofessional tasks, yet fail to recognize the mere relevant and fruitful distinctions that should be made *within* the teaching profession. Our failure to establish criteria for the wide range of tasks involved in the professional aspects of teaching has left the entire spectrum of talents and competencies among teachers totally unanalyzed. The implication which is left is that teaching is a single, universal function and teachers are interchangeable parts, assignable indiscriminately wherever a "slot" is open. The fact that this notion is patently nonsensical fails to alter the fact that it remains at the foundation of our perspective, guiding even our attempts at innovation.

We know that there are wide differences *among* teachers in such variables as knowledge of their subject and interests, success at large-group instruction, success at seminar instruction, entertainment value, empathy, and experience, to mention only a few. We know that the class of professional teachers represents an enormous diversity of personality characteristics and individual competencies which are related somehow to student learning in various possible instructional situations. But we do *not* have a staffing pattern in our schools that even begins to take such personal and professional differences into account. And we have never brought serious attention to bear on the criteria by which we might assess such differences and relate them to student learning. A role and task analysis of teaching in its various modes would demonstrate the need for both horizontal and vertical distinctions among teachers. In the context of differentiated responsibilities and rewards, we must recognize each teacher as a professional individual *and* as an individual professional. Our schools must have staff assignments which differentiate both levels and kinds of competence.

Given our ignorance of functional criteria for teacher performance, we are faced with the assignment and performance of professional roles which we have yet to discover. We simply do not know, at this point, how to distinguish merit in teachers other than by very vague notions of good and bad. We need to establish a structure in the schools that allows levels and kinds of professional competence to be recognized, thereby highlighting abilities which the existing structure blots out. Without a more flexible structure it is impossible to conceive of the many alternatives available for harnessing existing professional talent to the task of improving student learning. Proposals such as merit pay are simply further instances of the timerity and backwardness of current approaches to innovation. It is ill-considered to provide increasingly substantial differences in compensation and leave responsibilities exactly the same. We need to do more than merely add differential pay scales to the existing structure. What we must have is a carefully thought

out differentiated staff structure that allows for the usable differences within the profession. We need a structure that can help us to capitalize on the fact that some teachers are professionally senior to others; that there are more intelligent criteria for promotion than units taken or time served; that individual teachers have talents which can be uniquely indispensable to a given student's education in a given instructional setting; that contact hours are a poor index of a teacher's impact on a student's learning.

When education begins to recognize and allow for individual rather than "club member" professionalism, teachers will be able to use their professional competencies beyond the narrow confines of the traditional classroom. They will become active rather than passive agents in the school organization. They will, as they should, participate in determining the school's structure. The senior professional will be in a position to impart his knowledge and skill to the professional novice, the professionally ignorant, and the professionally inept via in-service training. In-service training could then begin to free itself from the two great fictions which guide its current practices: (a) that graduation from a teacher training institution bestows lifetime professional competence; (b) that initial training inadequacies will have a lifetime of professional consequences.

The training offered teachers before they enter the profession must become more relevant. We need clearer distinctions between the inert and active tasks involved in teaching, a clearer definition of teaching skills and criteria by which they might be assessed. We also need greater acceptance and consideration of the fact that teaching is not reducible entirely to skills, but involves a personal relationship between teacher and pupil.

We are already aware through gross task analysis that teachers may spend as much as fifty percent of their time at secretarial and clerical tasks. The more refined analysis which we so clearly need would point out the many inert tasks which teachers now perform that might more easily be handled by mechanical means. And such refined analysis of the teacher's role would inevitably bring much-needed attention to the humanistic aspects of teaching which require the full application of a teacher's professionalism. When the active aspects of teaching, those demanding the teacher's resourcefulness, are clearly separated from each other and from the inert tasks which lend themselves to mechanical and nonprofessional handling, then public education will begin to free itself from the structural constraints which currently limit its ability to meet the cognitive and affective needs of students. It is up to the profession to assure that the teacher's role is so well delineated that meaningful training for different roles can begin sooner and continue longer for each individual teacher with his own uniquely relevant professional competencies.

As a profession, we are still investing more lip service than labor in the problems of individualizing educational experiences. In practice, we still cling to the out-moded notion that there must be a single way to teach an entire group of students any particular subject matter, even when we know that a certain type of student studying a particular kind of material with the help of a given teacher might achieve dramatic levels of learning, while a different type of student might fail abysmally with the same material and the same teacher but succeed given a slightly different teacher. We must learn to match teachers, materials, structures, and students in order to create optimal individual learning situations. To date, we have failed to persistently explore the possible alternatives for so individualizing instruction.

Once understood, the failure becomes inexcusable: a failure to try, another demonstration of our timerity. Yet the thirty-student classroom continues unchanged.

If we *would* try, we could discover that much of what we do now that is measurably effective in school is significantly inefficient. We currently have no way of knowing, for example, whether the student who becomes proficient in Spanish in three years might in different instructional settings have become more proficient in two. We must learn to face the professional embarrassment of admitting that the criterion of time by which we currently measure the educational progress of a student is at best only incidentally relevant to the student's ability to perform intellectually. By discovering means to help students meet demonstrable performance goals, we could discover new alternatives for defining and reaching currently unmeasurable educational objectives. We might then effectively help students to learn by caring about what they learn, and we might motivate students to continue to learn both inside and outside the classroom. By beginning to make such discoveries, we could finally impart that social relevance to public education which is so painfully lacking in all but the most exceptional classrooms.

We must proceed with a far bolder spirit of inquiry than we have shown as a profession to date, and we must demonstrate that spirit at all levels of the profession. Such progress as we are making is halting; it limps toward a future that is rushing to meet us. All too often, useful outcomes of educational research fail to get generalized and implemented, and lie like cut flowers along the path to a promising future. Our greatest failures as a profession are due to alternatives unexamined, questions unasked, and paths not taken. Once again it is clear that our future success depends on our taking the necessary steps to make the process of change part of the educational woodwork. Where might such a process begin?

Money, though it cannot guarantee a more adequate level of training for teachers, can at least reduce the probabilities by its absence. Funds from foundations, the government, and other sources are becoming progressively more available. Unhappily, strong and already competent institutions are adept at applying for such funds, and they often preempt the weaker institutions where resources are more desperately needed. In effect, the rich get richer and the poor go nowhere. This cycle needs to be broken by formulas for aid which give weaker institutions an opportunity to gain perspective on their weaknesses. The weaker institutions are the ones who preeminently need the means to investigate ways of breaking the stereotype in which they and the teachers they train are trapped. Undoubtedly, viability should be a criterion for support, for some institutions are probably unsuited for the training of teachers, but it should not be a prerequisite. Rather, viability must be judged as *potential:* will the institution be viable *after* it has made use of support?

Training institutions which are unaware of the need to change or unwilling to change because of the risk involved must be supplied with the means to make change possible with less risk. They must be given the opportunity to innovate without being forced to repudiate publicly all that they have been doing. Transition models must be developed for all levels of education in order to treat the problems of introducing change separately from the changes themselves. Too often we have been frightened away from remedies in our hasty retreat from the problems of transition. It is, thus, a major fault of our

profession that we do not risk enough to have the potential even to fail dramatically--and hence we also lose the potential to succeed. Where necessary, we must find publicly acceptable excuses for setting out in radically new directions to allow our profession to adopt a dynamic rather than a defensive stance at the outset.

We must develop a professional understanding of those institutions that lack experience and resources when we encourage them to accept new programs or to initiate changes in their own programs. The criterion for evaluating any project undertaken by such an institution should be its viability upon conclusion, not its efficiency in reaching that goal. For some institutions, the process of getting there, of defeating static attitudes, may be the most difficult and important outcome. In such cases we should excuse a certain amount of inefficiency and lower our expectations of results. More emphasis should be placed on projects that are "self-reflective"--i.e., initiated and carried out internally for the benefit of the training institution. Conversely, we should attempt to balance off the preponderance of projects in which larger institutions research the activities of smaller ones. It is reasonable to expect greater efficiency from training institutions with an established reputation for leading research. It is unreasonable to assume that the small and apparently weaker institution lacks any potential for research leadership.

It is also becoming increasingly clear that the principles of educational research and pilot project management might themselves be profitably made the subject of experimentation. We desperately need new models of educational research and implementation. It is not unlikely, for example, that the current principles of funding and the rules governing project management have often given rise to a caution which spells inevitable failure. A good first step toward eliminating such crippling and excessive caution might be to admit that research evaluators are inevitably biased. We might then make it a condition of contract funding that a project in a given area be monitored by an agency outside the project whose bias is in favor of the stated project objectives--e.g., a project on differentiated teaching staff monitored by a group encouraged by this concept. Such a system would eliminate the frequent incidents wherein a project is evaluated by a group with opposing biases and is thus cut off from funds before it gets a chance to demonstrate failure or success.

If the guidelines proposed for educational research projects were more loosely written in order to encourage the widest possible latitude of investigation, then we might discover more simply because we were exploring more. Research needs to be flexible enough to shift emphasis to new objectives when serendipity so dictates: significant failures in meeting one's original objectives can lead to other lines of more promising research. In educational research, as in the classroom, less attention must be given to criteria of time and more to criteria of performance. Where possible, funding should center on a foreseeable and identifiable goal rather than on "two years of effort." Such performance-based funding would rescue many failing but crucial educational experiments and hasten the success of many others. Nor should the success or failure of a research project be the all-or-nothing proposition we now tend to make it. There are degrees and levels of success, and all too frequently the successful elements of a failing research enterprise are lost like the baby with the bathwater.

There are several other principles which might well be followed to give broader dimension to our educational research efforts. We should seek out opportunities to get double mileage out of our research projects--e.g., fellowship support to students for experimental tutoring in underprivileged areas. Where the resources of a project are limited and the problems many, more effective results might be obtained by concentrating both efforts and resources to investigate a single problem in depth. The reduction of effectiveness through diffusion of effort occurs frequently in present-day school districts--e.g., where innovation often fails due to a series of piecemeal efforts aimed at pleasing everyone. When research is undertaken in areas so new as to be almost universally unfamiliar, such as computer assisted instruction, we should not demand the same efficiency that we would expect from research on well-documented problems. Supplemental grants ought to be made with less grudging suspicion that good money is chasing after bad, and with more honest recognition of the tentative nature of any budget for research properly labeled as such. The overall objective of educational research and innovation must become the upgrading of professional competence and institutional organization so as to bear directly on the effects upon students. Without a deep rooted and pervasive concern for the success of students, education as a profession becomes a meaningless mockery of itself.

Thus, a new educational manpower and institutional models must be shaped out of the unity of a constantly changing educational context. This requires us to ask significant and penetrating questions about student needs, as well as some embarrassing ones about how, what, and why we teach. Is the liberal arts curriculum, historically the status-oriented base of traditional education, more or less relevant now than it has been in the past? Professionally, I doubt that we are sophisticated enough to answer so complex a question, but, professionally, we are clearly obligated to try. Indeed, it is not unlikely that the process of searching is itself a large part of the answer. Is it possible that a human communications curriculum, with the broadest possible scope (e.g., to both include and exclude spelling), would be more appropriate to our present and future? Perhaps not, but it is one possible alternative to our lack of answers to the fundamental question of what students should learn.

The question of what students in general, and Johnny in particular, should learn is one which, if honestly faced, will keep us on our professional toes well beyond the foreseeable future. If we even partially individualize instruction, then the end point of an education will not be, nor should it be, the same for all students. The closer we come to successfully differentiating educational goals to meet individual student needs, the more apparent it will become that every student is atypical--that each is a member of too many groups to be classified appropriately in one. The teacher specially trained to teach a curriculum built for Johnny as a member of a high IQ group may require the help of another teacher playing a particular educational role and performing a special educational task designed to help Johnny overcome the handicaps he inherited from a low socioeconomic background. The possibilities for professionalism in education are as infinite as our tenacity and boldness in facing the educational problems of all students as individuals. We in the profession must break the stereotypes, for we have created them and we have been blinded by them.

Our current failure to face curriculum and professional training problems honestly and competently is nowhere made more painfully clear than in the education we provide to culturally disadvantaged students. Despite the current

popularity of this part of the educational world, there are many probing questions that need to be asked, and many glimmerings of answers that desperately need to be found and implemented. What particular educational goals are most appropriate to the needs, interests, and abilities of the culturally disadvantaged? What differences in teacher training are required for those who will teach in such areas? Which particular differentiated staff structures are most likely to harvest the greatest effectiveness from the professional talent working in such areas? The possibilities for developing and using professional skills in teaching the culturally disadvantaged are unlimited. If we fail to apply our professional resources to this issue through imaginative use of research and innovation and innovative research, we only continue to demonstrate the extent to which our stereotypes are our masters.

It is ironic that we have found some answers to our professional shortcomings by backing into them. Good examples abound in what we have learned about teaching in general through recent efforts to reach special subgroups. We discovered that culturally underprivileged children need teachers who are concerned about them as individuals; teachers who are skilled at motivating students who are not yet eager to learn; teachers who can empathize with the problems that society creates for their students. Should we ask less of any teacher? Teaching the deaf to understand without hearing has taught us worlds about hearing without understanding. We need to search for means of integrating the education of special groups with that of society at large. But we also need to achieve a level of professionalism in dealing with the problems of the "general student" which equals that achieved in dealing with the handicapped.

How do we get from here to there as a profession? How do we get from dispensing knowledge in tasteless capsules to creating an environment which fosters the personal and intellectual growth of individuals? By moving forward boldly along the full breadth of the educational horizon: past the standard school, the standard teacher training. Above all, we must move past traditional education organized under standard administrative rules that protect the profession from the public and shield the student from the best in education. Perhaps a fitting conclusion would be the following partial list of priorities in education that I consider to be essential:

Dynamic definitions of and distinctions among educational roles and tasks, based on a continuously ongoing analysis of educational functions.

Teacher training built around such definitions.

Aid via resources and talent to initiate and support programs aimed at improving teacher training institutions.

Assignment and compensation of teachers on the basis of skill, talent, responsibility, and other relevant professional criteria.

Flexibility in the educational framework, school organization, and research enterprise.

Relevant performance criteria for evaluating teaching effectiveness.

Relevant performance criteria for evaluating student achievement.

In-service teacher training which will update and upgrade professional skills.

Cross-coordination of faculty effort to produce a meaningful interdisciplinary approach to learning.

Penetrating investigation of the relevance to society and the individual of what is and should be included in curriculums.

Cooperative service and research centers, on a regional or national basis, which will coordinate and disseminate efforts at all levels to upgrade professional competence.

Concentrated attention on the problems of educating underprivileged individuals and institutions.

The more of the foregoing priorities that we satisfy, the less likely are we to ever again be professionally satisfied. It is not, however, professional comfort but professional competence that is at issue, and to accomplish that we must continually reexamine the structure, functions, and growing responsibilities of education. Like the medical profession in its battle with disease, and the legal profession in its conflict with inequities in the law, we will not win all engagements in our struggle with ignorance, but neither can we lose if we have the boldness to join the battle. If we continue to seek the security of sitting still, we will condemn ourselves professionally to the rank of astrologers.